

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 24, 2009
4:00 pm in ELC 405

Attendance: Gerry Calvasina (Faculty Senate President), Brad Cook (Provost), Nathan Barker, David Berri, Robin Boneck (Treasurer), Emily Dean, Richard Eissinger, Fred Govedich, Alan Hamlin, Michael Harvey (Parliamentarian), Derek Hein, Deb Hill (President-elect), Bruce Howard, John Howell, Lawrence Johnson, Andrew Marvick, Mark Miller, Kevin Stein, Michael Ostrowsky, Tony Pellegrini, Philip Roché, Matt Schmidt, Julie Taylor, Andreas Weingartner (Secretary), Denise Woodberry (Past President).

1. Call to Order by Faculty Senate President Calvasina
2. Review and approval of minutes from August meeting.
Motion (Robin Boneck) to approve the minutes and seconded (Michael Harvey).
Minutes approved.
3. Provost Cook
 - a. Searches for deans and associate provost: The new Dean of Science will be announced tomorrow (9/25/09). The CIET Dean position was offered to a candidate, but the candidate did not accept. The new Dean of Library will be announced early next week. The Associate Provost search was not successful. An announcement will be made tomorrow (9/25/09) about the Interim Associate Provost.
 - b. Academic strategic planning: Provost Cook has met or will meet with each department. Planning is only useful if plans are used, have faculty input and support, and are supported by budget. The Provost has received input from students, faculty, chairs, and deans. Different focus groups will focus on different aspects of strategic planning.
 - c. Mission based funding mechanism instead of enrollment based funding: The University of Utah and Utah State University are also interested in mission based funding. This will probably not happen this year as it requires additional money.
 - d. Enrollment is above 8000 for the first time. Enrollment growth averages 6% to 7% each year. What is the ideal size for SUU?
 - e. SUU needs to choose peer institutions that we want to be compared with.
 - f. In 2002-2003 there was a large increase in tuition based on research done by business faculty. At the time, the increase in tuition did not result in a decrease in enrollment. The same faculty members are now looking at the current situation to determine whether a tuition increase would be appropriate.
 - g. John Howell suggested that students in the Master of Public Administration program could contribute towards a model for mission based funding.

4. **Bill O'Neal: Grants**

Proposal for the allocation of indirect costs: 30% of collective indirect cost goes to the Provost, 25% to the deans, 25% to chairs, 10% for budget finance, 5% for grants office, and 5% for the library.

In the past, indirect costs have on average only been 18% of the grant total at SUU. Deb Hill asked how the money is allocated if the grant is awarded to faculty members from different colleges. Bill O'Neal suggested that it should be prorated according to salary.

Motion (Alan Hamlin) to endorse the proposal and seconded (Michael Ostrowsky).
Motion passed unanimously.

Policy for responsible scientific conduct is required by NIH and NSF (starting January 4) in order to get funding. Money is required to get training in place.
5. **Academic Affairs Committee:**
 - a. **Policy 6.42: Program and Course Fees.** Individual course fees are changed to program course fees. Motion for endorsement of changes to Policy 6.42 from Deb Hill, seconded by Robin Boneck. Discussion: The reason for this change is that it simplifies accounting. The motion is approved unanimously.
 - b. **Policy 6.27: Faculty Workload.** 'NCATE standard' was changed to 'TEAC standard'; 'lecturer or instructor' was changed to 'FTE non-tenure track faculty'. Changes were approved unanimously by the faculty senate.
6. **Alan Hamlin: Faculty Evaluations**

The faculty development committee put together a proposal: Each college should have the choice to either 1) continue with the current evaluation system or 2) choose a different evaluation model that must first be approved by the Provost. The committee identified advantages and disadvantages of this proposal. Some advantages are: More flexibility for each division to set its own standards, and greater input from faculty. The proposal does not require a change in policy, but would be attached as clarification to the current policy. One disadvantage identified was that the University LRT committee will have to consider different evaluation systems. This would not be a problem if the role of the University LRT committee is mostly one of oversight. Provost Cook suggested that student evaluations should be balanced by other measures. Student evaluations should mostly be used for the benefit of the faculty member to improve. Deb Hill pointed out that if the purpose of student evaluations is mostly developmental, the evaluations should be done earlier during the semester.

Alan Hamlin: Other institutions require that there is a common set of questions across the university, but allow each school to choose their own additional questions. Provost Cook suggested that the proposal is a procedure rather than a policy. Deb Hill made a motion to accept the Proposed Faculty Senate Procedure on Student Evaluations. Fred Govedich seconded the motion. The proposal was approved unanimously.

7. Andrew Marvick: Distinguished Faculty Lecture
Funding of \$500 per lecture comes from the President's Office. The committee may ask the President to increase this amount.
8. Other Business
9. Motion for Executive Session.
Motion (Deb Hill) for executive session and seconded (Robin Boneck).
10. Motion to Adjourn by Robin Boneck.

Next Meeting: October 22, 2009 @ 4:00 pm in ELC Room 405